arXiv:0803.3871v2 [physics.gen-ph] 9 Jun 2008

BATEMAN ON LIGHT: SYNCHROTRON RAYS

H. C. POTTER

Abstract. For over a century physicists have sought a mathematical theory that unites the dual, wave and corpuscle, behaviors that light exhibits. In the early twentieth century H. Bateman was studying a solution that uses wave functions with singularities to mark light quanta location in space and time as potential singularities do for material particles. He published an incomplete, mathematically obtuse paper applying his scheme to presciently predict synchrotron rays well before they were experimentally observed. Here, I clarify the presentation in Bateman's paper and supply a missing demonstration that it predicts orbit plane localization and previously unexplained orbit plane normal polarization.

Key words and phrases. Light, Duality, Localization, Singularities, Potentials, Fields.

In the twentieth century first quarter, H. Bateman (1882-1946) was studying electromagnetic theory based on a generalized potential formalism. This formalism is elaborated in his book [1]. Two applications are significant. On cursory reading, the first [2] appears to predict synchrotron rays more than 30 years prior to their observation [3] and classical power spectrum prediction [4]. On the same basis, the second [5] appears to predict pair production 9 years before its 1933 observation [6] with no other extant electromagnetic explanation. I use the word "appears" intentionally, because Bateman never fully developed these applications. In this paper I apply the first paper to explain synchrotron light polarization normal to the orbit plane and to predict ray localization within the orbit plane.

Bateman takes as his generalized potential the quantity

$$V = \frac{f(\tau)}{\sigma} \tag{1}$$

where

$$\sigma = (x-\xi)l + (y-\eta)m + (z-\zeta)n - (t-\tau)c^2p \tag{B4}$$

and all the l, m, n, p and ξ, η, ζ may be τ dependent functions. The function V will satisfy the wave equation

$$\Box_c V = \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2} - \frac{1}{c^2}\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial t^2} = 0 \tag{2}$$

when $\sigma \neq 0$ and

$$l^2 + m^2 + n^2 = c^2p^2. \tag{B3b}$$

The function σ defined by Eq.(B4) vanishes when (x, y, z, t) lies on a curve Γ defined by

$$x = \xi(\tau), \quad y = \eta(\tau), \quad z = \zeta(\tau) \quad and \quad t = \tau. \tag{B1}$$

But σ also vanishes when (x, y, z, t) lies on lines through $(\xi(\tau), \eta(\tau), \zeta(\tau), \tau)$ for $t > \tau$. To prove this consider the sphere

$$[x-\xi(\tau)]^2 + [y-\eta(\tau)]^2 + [z-\zeta(\tau)]^2 = R^2. \tag{B2'}$$

The Eq.(B2') sphere represents a retarded wave front when

$$\tau = t - \frac{R}{c}. \tag{3}$$

Eq.(B4) will vanish at

$$x = R\tfrac{l}{cp} + \xi(\tau), \quad y = R\tfrac{m}{cp} + \eta(\tau), \quad z = R\tfrac{n}{cp} + \zeta(\tau) \quad and \quad t = \tfrac{R}{c} + \tau. \tag{4}$$

So when Eqs.(B3b) and (3) are satisfied, Eq.(4) parameter R defines a line on which σ vanishes that passes through the Eq.(B2') sphere center at $(\xi(\tau), \eta(\tau), \zeta(\tau), \tau)$. For fixed τ, Eq.(3) says the Eq.(4) point moves with velocity $\mathbf{c} = (\frac{l}{p}, \frac{m}{p}, \frac{n}{p})$. At τ on the curve Γ, the velocity is $\mathbf{v} = (\xi', \eta', \zeta')$ when the primes indicate τ differentiation. So, says Bateman,

$$l(\tau)\xi'(\tau) + m(\tau)\eta'(\tau) + n(\tau)\zeta'(\tau) = (-v^2)p(\tau) \tag{B3a'}$$

determines the angle at the Eq.(B2') sphere center between the singularity velocity on the Eq.(4) line and the singularity velocity on the Eq.(B1) curve Γ. For plane, circular orbits like that described by Eq.(14), below, Eq.(B3a') takes the Eq.(13) form; but there is no extant proof that Eq.(B3a') is valid for any other case. When $\mathbf{v}$ does not change direction, this development will exhibit cylindrical symmetry about the line defined by Γ. This is manifest in the plane orbit ray case examples below where radial acceleration is ignored. When $\mathbf{v}$ does change direction, this symmetry should be broken. The latter contradicts common light beam depictions which presume the cylindrical symmetry for linear motion to persist. The presumption is refuted, however, by [3, Fig. 5 frame 10 and Ref.2]. This shows beam size increase in the orbit plane with the energy sustaining r-f turned off. Confounding by electron beam cross section convolution may explain this error.

As a mathematician, Bateman attempted to perform this development using Eqs.(B1), (B2'), (B3a'), (B3b) and (B4) as initial premises. In all Bateman equations with primed equation numbers, including Eq.(B5') below, the parenthetical factors designate my revisions. I find Bateman's development unintelligible, even though he does revisit this problem in his book [1, Sec. 44] without reference to the earlier work. The development above, however, does produce Bateman's result that for a primary Eq.(1) singularity M moving with velocity $\mathbf{v}$ on a curve Γ there are at least two secondary Eq.(1) singularities radiating with velocity c along "rectilinear rays through each point of this curve" with the angle between the rays and the primary singularity motion having a cosine equal to $-v/c$. This v angle dependence agrees with [4, Eq. 1.48] when expressed as his $\sin^2$ dependence.

To connect the secondary singularities with light, Bateman defines the vector and scalar potentials as

$$A_x = \tfrac{l}{\sigma}, \quad A_y = \tfrac{m}{\sigma}, \quad A_z = \tfrac{n}{\sigma} \quad \textit{and} \quad \Phi = \tfrac{(c)p}{\sigma}. \tag{B5'}$$

When primary singularity velocity v is always less than c, the Eq.(B2') spheres for proximate instants are nested. So the Eq.(B5') potentials at (x, y, z, t) will be uniquely associated with a curve Γ point for $v < c$. With σ defined by Eq.(B4), Eq.(B3b) causes the Eq.(B5') potentials to satisfy the Lorenz condition

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla} \bullet \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = 0, \tag{5}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nabla} = (\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z})$. When the electric and magnetic fields are calculated from the Eq.(B5') potentials using the relations [1, Eqs.(268)]

$$\mathbf{H} = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{A} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbf{E} = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}\Phi - \tfrac{1}{c}\tfrac{\partial \mathbf{A}}{\partial t} \tag{6}$$

with v and the l, m, n and p constant on Γ, the fields obtained are null. When v varies with τ however, Eq.(B3a') forces variation with τ for some or all the l, m, n, p and ξ', η', ζ', and the calculated fields need not be null. These fields satisfy the Eq.(2) wave equation, because the Eq.(B5') potentials do; and they satisfy the vacuum Maxwell equations [1, Eq.(1)]

$$\left.\begin{array}{ll} \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t}, & \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{E} = -\frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial t} \\ \boldsymbol{\nabla} \bullet \mathbf{H} = 0, & \boldsymbol{\nabla} \bullet \mathbf{E} = 0. \end{array}\right\} \tag{7}$$

When some or all the l, m, n, p and ξ', η', ζ' vary with τ the above relations are satisfied at each τ value defining a position on the Eq.(B1) curve Γ. But the actual fields spawned at τ onto the expanding Eq.(B2') sphere along the line given by Eq.(4) can be taken to be given by the Eqs.(B5') potential changes at τ. The Eqs.(6) magnetic and electric field components spawned at τ are then given by

$$\left.\begin{array}{rcccl} H_x & = & \frac{\partial A_z}{\partial \eta} - \frac{\partial A_y}{\partial \zeta} & = & \frac{n'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \eta} - \frac{m'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \zeta}, \\ H_y & = & \frac{\partial A_x}{\partial \zeta} - \frac{\partial A_z}{\partial \xi} & = & \frac{l'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \zeta} - \frac{n'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \xi}, \\ H_z & = & \frac{\partial A_y}{\partial \xi} - \frac{\partial A_x}{\partial \eta} & = & \frac{m'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \xi} - \frac{l'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \eta}, \\ E_x & = & -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \xi} - \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial A_x}{\partial \tau} & = & -\frac{cp'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \xi} - \frac{l'}{c\sigma}, \\ E_y & = & -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \eta} - \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial A_y}{\partial \tau} & = & -\frac{cp'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \eta} - \frac{m'}{c\sigma}, \\ E_z & = & -\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial \zeta} - \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial A_z}{\partial \tau} & = & -\frac{cp'}{\sigma}\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \zeta} - \frac{n'}{c\sigma}. \end{array}\right\} \qquad (8)$$

In the above, Bateman's

$$K \equiv \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \tau} = l'(x-\xi) + m'(y-\eta) + n'(z-\zeta) - c^2 p'(t-\tau) = 0 \qquad (9)$$

when the (x, y, z, t) lie on the Eq.(4) line at τ, because there $K = R(ll' + mm' + nn' - c^2 pp')/cp = 0$ by Eq.(B3b). The Eqs.(8) simplify considerably when the Eq.(B1) Γ lies in a plane. Then, for zero Eq.(B4) σ the orbit's normal τ derivative vanishes, $\frac{\partial \tau}{\partial \zeta} = 0$ when $\zeta(\tau) = 0$ for example. If both n and n' vanish for rays in the instanced orbit plane, the Eqs.(8) spawned fields have magnetic component normal to and electric fields in the Eq.(B1) Γ plane. More general rays are possible. In particular, rays with components normal to the orbit plane may be found. But electric fields for these [7, Figure 5] have components normal to the orbit plane and, having longitudinal components, are not even Maxwell light like. If they exist, their intensities must be small, because only orbital plane polarization has been reported [3, Ref. 2].

Using Eqs.(8) we can confirm that $\mathbf{E} \bullet \mathbf{H} = 0$ and derive an expression for the Poynting vector $\mathbf{E} \times \mathbf{H}$. Bateman says the Poynting vector is along the line described by Eq.(4). This must be since the singularity moves with the expanding Eq.(B2') sphere radius, but longitudinal field absence must be confirmed. Finally, the Eq.(8) fields must be shown to satisfy the Eq.(7) Maxwell field relations. Bateman's work is incomplete, because he never addresses these problems. Below, I show how these concerns can restrict the possible fields and apply the result to synchrotron radiation.

To use the Eq.(8) spawned fields in the Eq.(7) Maxwell relations, I will consider the (x, y, z, t) coordinate dependence to be that contained in the denominator's Eq.(B4) σ. But after component differentiation σ can be removed as serving only as a space-time location indicator at the singularity *on the expanding wave front*. This removal will be indicated by lower case fields represented by transformations like $h_x = \sigma H_x$. With this notation the spawned fields must satisfy the following:

$$\left.\begin{array}{rcc}
\boldsymbol{\nabla} \bullet \mathbf{H} = 0 & \Rightarrow & l h_x + m h_y + n h_z = 0 \\
(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial t})_x = 0 & \Rightarrow & -cph_x + m\varepsilon_z - n\varepsilon_y = 0 \\
(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial t})_y = 0 & \Rightarrow & -cph_y + n\varepsilon_x - l\varepsilon_z = 0 \\
(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial t})_z = 0 & \Rightarrow & -cph_z + l\varepsilon_y - m\varepsilon_x = 0 \\
\boldsymbol{\nabla} \bullet \mathbf{E} = 0 & \Rightarrow & l\varepsilon_x + m\varepsilon_y + n\varepsilon_z = 0 \\
(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{H} - \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t})_x = 0 & \Rightarrow & cp\varepsilon_x + mh_z - nh_y = 0 \\
(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{H} - \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t})_y = 0 & \Rightarrow & cp\varepsilon_y + nh_x - lh_z = 0 \\
(\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{H} - \frac{1}{c}\frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t})_z = 0 & \Rightarrow & cp\varepsilon_z + lh_y - mh_x = 0
\end{array}\right\} \tag{10}$$

When written out using the Eqs.(8) spawned fields, the first four Eq.(10) relations are homogeneous expressions for the l', m', n' and cp' with coefficient determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix}
m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} - n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} & n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} - l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} & l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} - m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} & 0 \\
0 & cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} + \frac{n}{c} & -cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} - \frac{m}{c} & -m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} + n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} \\
-cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} - \frac{n}{c} & 0 & cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} + \frac{l}{c} & l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} - n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} \\
cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} + \frac{m}{c} & -cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} - \frac{l}{c} & 0 & m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} - l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta}
\end{vmatrix} . \tag{11}$$

Inspection shows that the $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \bullet \mathbf{H}$ expression is linearly dependent on the three $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{E}$ expressions. When the Eq.(B1) Γ lies in a plane containing the ray, only one $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{E}$ expression remains, that giving the normal **H** field. When written out using the Eqs.(8) spawned fields, the last four Eq.(10) relations have the coefficient determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix}
-\frac{l}{c} & -\frac{m}{c} & -\frac{n}{c} & -l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} - m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} - n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} \\
-p - m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} - n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} & m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} & n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} & -cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} \\
l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} & -p - l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} - n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} & n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} & -cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} \\
l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} & m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} & -p - l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} - m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} & -cp\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta}
\end{vmatrix} . \tag{12}$$

In this case, inspection shows that the $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \bullet \mathbf{E}$ expression is linearly dependent on the three $\boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{H}$ expressions and these allow

$$\left.\begin{array}{llllll} & m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} & +n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} & =-p & \text{when} & \frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi}=0, \\ l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} & & +n\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta} & =-p & \text{when} & \frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta}=0, \\ l\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} & +m\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} & & =-p & \text{when} & \frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta}=0. \end{array}\right\} \tag{13}$$

As an example, consider the case where the primary singularity follows the curve Γ given by

$$x_p=\rho\cos\omega\tau, \quad y_p=\rho\sin\omega\tau, \quad z_p=0, \quad \textit{and} \quad t_p=\tau \tag{14}$$

for constant ρ and ω. Using the functional designations in Eq.(B1), we find

$$\tan\omega\tau=\frac{\eta}{\xi}, \quad \frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi}=-\frac{\eta}{v\rho}, \quad \frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta}=\frac{\xi}{v\rho} \tag{15}$$

when $v=\omega\rho$, $\xi(\tau)=\rho\cos(\omega\tau)$ and $\eta(\tau)=\rho\sin(\omega\tau)$. So, for $n=0$ we have the Eqs.(13) and (B3b) to solve for $\frac{l}{cp}$ and $\frac{m}{cp}$. This gives

$$\frac{l_\pm}{cp}=\beta\sin(\omega\tau)\pm\sqrt{1-\beta^2}\cos(\omega\tau), \quad \frac{m_\pm}{cp}=-\beta\cos(\omega\tau)\pm\sqrt{1-\beta^2}\sin(\omega\tau) \tag{16}$$

where $\beta=\frac{v}{c}$. Using these, we can now calculate the angle at the Eq.(B2') sphere center between the singularity velocity on the ray $\mathbf{c}=(\frac{l}{p},\frac{m}{p},0)$ and the singularity velocity on the Eq.(B1) curve:

$$\cos\delta=\frac{\mathbf{c}\bullet\mathbf{v}}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{c}\bullet\mathbf{c})(\mathbf{v}\bullet\mathbf{v})}}=\frac{\frac{l}{cp}\xi'+\frac{m}{cp}\eta'}{v}=-\beta. \tag{17}$$

This recovers Eq.(B3a') and agrees with the value given in [4], but I have found no published light beam divergence measurements. Since Eq.(B5') p includes particle charge, changing its sign allows ray direction reversal. From Eqs.(10), we find the fields:

$$\varepsilon_x=-\frac{m\pm}{cp}h_z, \quad \varepsilon_y=\frac{l\pm}{cp}h_z, \quad h_z=\frac{l\pm}{cp}\varepsilon_y-\frac{m\pm}{cp}\varepsilon_x \quad . \tag{18}$$

Clearly, the spawned $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ field is normal to the spawn direction, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\bullet\mathbf{c}=0$. So the Poynting vector is in the spawn direction. When the directional coefficients in the electric field components are held constant at their spawn time values but h_z is taken to be a periodic t_s function, the secondary singularities will carry periodic fields along the line given by

$$x_s = R\tfrac{l}{cp} + x_p, \quad y_s = R\tfrac{m}{cp} + y_p, \quad z_s = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad t_s = \tfrac{R}{c} + t_p \tag{19}$$

with polarization in the orbit plane in conformity with Eq.(8) and as observed [3, Ref. 2]. To my knowledge, this prediction is new. The fields satisfy the Eq.(7) Maxwell equations when the periodic function argument is taken to be the retarded time. This example shows that the Bateman scheme for secondary singularity association with light can give new, corroborative and verified results.

To reinforce this conclusion, consider rays emitted at a fixed point on the orbit described by Eqs.(14) and (15) ignoring radial motion. In a plane normal to the orbit and tangent to it at $x_p = \rho$ and $y_p = 0$, the rays will be described by Eq.(19) with $l = 0$ and $z_s = R\frac{n}{cp}$. While $\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\zeta}$ still vanishes, we now have from Eq.(15) the conditions $\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\xi} = 0$ and $\frac{\partial\tau}{\partial\eta} = \frac{1}{v}$. Using these in Eq.(8) shows that h_x, ε_y and ε_z are the only nonzero field components with Eqs.(10) requiring the relations

$$\varepsilon_y = -\tfrac{n}{cp}h_x, \quad \varepsilon_z = \tfrac{m}{cp}h_x, \quad h_x = \tfrac{m}{cp}\varepsilon_z - \tfrac{n}{cp}\varepsilon_y \ . \tag{20}$$

Eqs.(11) and (12) show that satisfying the Eq.(7) Maxwell relations at the spawn point requires $\frac{p'}{p} = \frac{m'}{m} = \frac{n'}{n}$, $p = -\frac{m}{v}$ and $n^2 = (\frac{c^2}{v^2} - 1)m^2$. Clearly the Eq.(20) h_x is orthogonal to the spawned electric field and both are orthogonal to the ray direction, $(0, \frac{m}{cp}, \frac{n}{cp})$; but as predicted above the polarization has a component orthogonal to the orbit plane. As a final point, the ray directions in planes between the orbit plane and the above orthogonal plane can be examined. For planes touching the orbit at $x_p = \rho$ and $y_p = 0$ with normal $(\cos\Theta, 0, \sin\Theta)$, included rays with direction $\left(\frac{l}{cp}, \frac{m}{cp}, \frac{n}{cp}\right)$ must satisfy the relation $l\cos\Theta + n\sin\Theta = 0$. For the Eq.(14) orbit, Eq.(13) and Eq.(B3b) give $\frac{m}{cp} = -\beta$ and $(\frac{l}{cp})^2 = (1 - \beta^2)\sin^2\Theta$. In these planes the angle between the ray and orbit direction is $\cos\delta = \left(\frac{l}{cp}, \frac{m}{cp}, \frac{n}{cp}\right) \bullet (0, 1, 0)$, but again the polarization has a component orthogonal to the orbit plane. From this and [3], I conclude that, although electromagnetic fields exist in all ray directions [7] for the Eq.(B5') potentials, only Bateman rays from orbits for which $\mathbf{v}$ changes direction have significant intensity as required by Eq.(8). The implication is stark: Bateman rays enhance conventional electromagnetic field descriptions.

Bateman has published other scheme applications. In his book [1, Ch. VIII], Bateman applies his scheme to developing the electromagnetic field for a simple moving singularity and by superposition to a moving doublet. He also revisits the secondary singularity problem. The general procedure is the same for all these examples. First, define a generalized potential satisfying the homogeneous wave equation with singularities appropriate for the problem. Then develop expressions for the electromagnetic fields that are appropriate for the chosen generalized potential. This method associates singularities with the electromagnetic field to give the photon localization [8] that has long eluded explanation [9]. For this reason, the method warrants further evaluation with application specifically directed to describing familiar light behaviors such as reflection, refraction and diffraction. The last needs work [1, pp.90-94]. But the logarithmic generalized potential in [5] does describe ray bifurcation. Requiring the potential function to satisfy a homogeneous wave equation imposes constraints on the incoming and outgoing ray parameters. Matching conditions at the bifurcation can be chosen to describe pair production, Compton scattering or reflection with refraction. Bateman mentions only the first possibility and none have been worked out. But with the development presented here as a guide the work should be facilitated. With this, sequential composition with [10] matching would provide a purely mathematical explanation for observed Mach-Zehnder duality [11, 12]. The corpuscular response should be easily obtained. Interference, however, is likely to require the wave front singularities to be assigned nonzero spatial dimensions and the path length difference to be less than the corpuscle coherence length [13, Sec. IV.C]. I leave these developments as an exercise for the interested reader. Prior explanation attempts [14, Sec. 5.] and [15, 16], while lacking Bateman localization, provide relevant considerations.

Clearly, our undergraduates should be introduced to Bateman's solution to the wave/corpuscle duality problem on first exposure to the wave equation. This exposure could be reinforced with subsequent laboratory work [16, 17].

REFERENCES

[1] H. Bateman, The mathematical analysis of electrical and optical wave-motion on the basis of Maxwell's equations, Cambridge University Press, 1915 & http://www.archive.org/details/mathematicalanal00baterich.

[2] H. Bateman, "A New Type of Solution of Maxwell's Equations," The Annals of Mathematics, 2nd Ser., **15**:1/4(1913-1914)106-111.

[3] F. R. Elder *et al.*, "Radiation from Electrons Accelerated in a Synchrotron," Phys. Rev. **74**:1(1948)52-56.

[4] J. Schwinger, "On the Classical Radiation of Accelerated Electrons," Phys. Rev. **75**:12(1949)1912-1925.

[5] H. Bateman and P. Ehrenfest, "The Derivation of Electromagnetic Fields from a Basic Wave-Function," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **10**:9 (1924)369-374.

[6] P. M. S. Blackett, http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/1948/blackett-lecture.html.

[7] J. H. Hannay and M.R. Jeffrey, "The electric field of synchrotron radiation," Proc. Roy. Soc. A **461**(2005)3599-3610.

[8] T. L. Dimitrova and A. Weis, " The wave-particle duality of light: A demostration experiment," Am. J. Phys. **76**:2(2008)137-142.

[9] O. Keller, "On the theory of spatial localization of photons," Physics Reports **411**:1-3(2005)1-232.

[10] A. J. Dempster and H. F. Batho, "Light Quanta and Interference," Phys. Rev. **30**:5(1927)644-648.

[11] V. Jacques *et al.*, "Experimental Realization of Wheeler's Delayed-Choice Gedanken Experiment," Science **315**(2007)966-968.

[12] E. J. Galvez *et al.*, "Interference with correlated photons: Five quantum mechanics experiments for undergraduates," Am. J. Phys. **73**:2(2005)127-140.

[13] N. Gisin *et al.*, "Quantum cryptography," Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**:1(2002)145-195.

[14] T. Marshall and E. Santos, "Stochastic Optics: A Reaffirmation of the Wave Nature of Light," Found. Phys. **18**:2(1988)185-223.

[15] P N Kaloyerou, "The GRA beam-splitter experiments and particle-wave duality of light," J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39**(2006)11541-11566 & http://www.arxiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/0503201.

[16] M. B. Schneider and I. A. LaPuma, "A simple experiment for discussion of quantum interference and which-way measurement," Am. J. Phys. **70**:3(2002)266-271.

[17] S. C. Sahyun *et al.*, "Undergraduate student laboratory experience at the Synchrotron Radiation Center," Am. J. Phys. **74**:11(2006)987-991.

[18] I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for comments that confirm my introductory statement about Bateman's works on electromagnetism.